

THE NATIONAL COUNCIL
FOR SOVIET AND EAST EUROPEAN RESEARCH

Herbert S. Levine
Chairman, Board of Trustees
Vladimir I. Toumanoff
Executive Director

Suite 304
1755 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036
(202) 387-0168

STATINTL

September 24, 1982



SOVA
CIA
Washington, D.C. 20505

Dear 

Enclosed is some material on the endowment legislation.

Cordially,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Herb Levine".

Herbert S. Levine

Enclosure

STATEMENT

on

"Soviet-Bloc Research and Training Act of 1982"

(S.2919)

by

Vladimir I. Toumanoff
Executive Director
National Council for Soviet and East European Research

Prepared for Hearings of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations,
September 22, 1982

THE TESTIMONY OF VLADIMIR I. TOUMANOFF
Executive Director of the National Council
for Soviet and East European Research

BEFORE THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Hearings on S.2919, on September 22, 1982

Mr. Chairman, Senators, I would like to thank you for this opportunity to contribute to the information available to yourselves and the rest of the Senate as you consider the legislation proposed in S.2919. For the most part I will speak about the National Council, of which I am the Executive Director. But I'd like to start with the most accurate financial data we have on what has been happening to Soviet and East European studies over the last 15 years or so.

According to two systematic surveys, funding dropped by almost 70% between 1965 and 1980, and is projected to drop by another 8% by the end of 1982. Stanford University conducted one of these surveys. In 1976 it requested data for the period 1965-1975 on the operating budgets of leading United States university centers of advanced research and training in the Soviet and East European field. In 1981 the Rockefeller Foundation conducted a similar survey covering the period 1975-1980, and estimated budgets for 1981 and '82. Together, these surveys show a drop, in constant dollars, of almost exactly 77% from 1965 to 1982.

By these measures, programs of advanced training and research are trying to survive on 23% of their 1965 funds. They are not doing well. Gifted students are the first to turn elsewhere as

they perceive the effects of the catastrophic decline, and with their departure goes the rationale for everything else at universities. All of the elements are affected, and reinforce each other in decline: the staffing and maintenance of research libraries, administrative and secretarial support staff, office space and equipment, allocations of computer time, publications support, advanced course offerings, appointments for young faculty to replace those who retire, and weight in university counsels and decisions. Bit by bit the apparatus that was built after the second World War to give us our national capability for expert knowledge and analysis of the USSR and Eastern Europe is coming apart. It is a slow process, but it has been going on for more than ten years now. If it is allowed to continue, in another ten years we will not have a capability outside the government and recruits for Government needs will be unavailable. To recreate the national capability after that would take another decade or more, at enormous cost. Just to reconstitute a discontinued research library would be a staggering task. That is the nature of the national problem that has matured to the point of bringing it to Congress, and which is addressed by S.2919.

The legislation is not a total remedy, nor is it appropriate that the Federal Government should bear the burden of remedy alone, or even in major part. Universities, properly, provide the great preponderance of support. Foundations, corporations, private citizens, and other sources also provide a share. But in spite of continuing appeals to all of these traditional supporters, the fact is inescapable of the precipitous decline in the face of a national need that can

only increase in the future. Under the circumstances it is most appropriate that the Federal Government, as the single most direct, and largest beneficiary of trained personnel, and end-user of research, should contribute a share of the remedy. The legislation seems to me carefully drawn to address those functions in the field of Soviet and East European studies for which the Government is the most natural constituent: the presence of American specialists in the USSR and Eastern Europe, the broadest public use of Washington's research data, ongoing contact between U.S. Government specialists and those outside, a modest program of advanced training in skills relevant to Government concerns, a national research program on an agenda designed in consultation with the Government, and the public dissemination of reliable, independently developed information about the Soviet bloc.

In recognition of the national interest in checking the decline in our capability, officials of the Executive Branch, and academic specialists on the USSR and Eastern Europe, conceived of and established the National Council in 1978 as a vehicle for federal support for the field. The Council's charter is to conduct a national program of advanced research, and thereby to help ensure a future cadre of specialists. It has done quite well, and I will return to some measures of its performance later in my testimony. Of greater importance, however, is the need for Congressional action. Let me turn to that.

Professor Levine has testified to the critical uncertainties of whether, at what level, and when, funds for the work of the Council may be available from year to year. As he says, such a stamp of unreliability deters gifted individuals from making a professional commitment to the field, and threatens to defeat the ultimate purpose of the effort. Why does such uncertainty mark the work?

It happens for a number of contributory reasons, and one overwhelming one. Among the lesser reasons are:

- There is no locus within the Executive Branch that has both the responsibility and the financial resources to maintain our current knowledge of the Soviet bloc, and our national capability to develop such knowledge, outside of the Government.

- Funding by contribution from a number of different Departments and Agencies involves elaborate administrative machinery, the cooperation of hundreds of individuals who do not know of each others' existence, and unending problems and complications.

- The personnel involved in the decisions each year whether or not to fund the effort, and if so at what level, as well as those involved in executing the decisions, turn over rapidly. As a consequence individuals who know nothing of this unique undertaking are constantly appearing in positions where their positive action, and even initiative, is critical. Catching their attention for a program costing a few hundred thousands, when their concerns are with hundred of millions or billions, is

-The processes of budget formation in each Department, in the Executive Branch, and in Congress, as well as the subsequent processes of appropriations, allocations, etc. are themselves uncertain. At the microscopic level of the Council's funding, it simply gets overlooked, or shunted aside for larger concerns.

All of these circumstances contribute to the funding problems which threaten to defeat the purposes for which the Government and academic community created the National Council. But the overwhelming reason is the lack of a Congressional mandate.

Without a Congressional mandate, every Executive Branch official involved in supporting the Council is apprehensive that either he, or worse, his superiors in whose name he acts, will be subject to criticism. It is infinitely easier for an apprehensive official to say "No," or take no action, especially one new to his responsibilities, who doesn't know about the Council or its background. In the absence of a mandate from Congress, there is no responsibility to act, and there is no basis on which to appeal inaction except conviction and courage. There lies the root cause of delay, of hazardous and haphazard existence. Without your endorsement through legislation, the entire effort flounders in accidental neglect, in administrative complication, and in doubt. Four years have taught me that this unique start of a truly collaborative program by Government and scholars to address an urgent national need, cannot be effective, and will ultimately fail without your sanction and approval. What's worse, is that having been started in the full

view and support of the profession, its failure will only make matters worse.

What is its track record, is this effort worth supporting?

Economy of operation. By requiring cost sharing, the Council receives one third more research effort than it pays for. Every university that receives federal research contracts negotiates with the Government annually an administrative overhead rate that applies to every federal contract it receives. This administrative surcharge, called the "indirect cost rate," is based on a complicated formula and varies from institution to institution, and from year to year. Roughly speaking, it runs from about 50% to over 100% of the direct costs. From the start, the Council has limited this charge to 20% or less on all of its research contracts, and requires universities to contribute the difference as their share of the cost of the project. This is a step the Government cannot legally take. On that score alone, the Council has calculated that the universities have been contributing one dollar for every three Council dollars. Put another way, if the Government had contracted for the same research, it would have cost one third more.

Since the start, the Council's own total administrative costs have been 10.5% of the funds entrusted to it by the Government. All the rest have gone into the research program. In part this is done by simple frugality. Government contracting officers estimated that the Council would need a staff of thirty to administer the program. The Council has a staff of four. In part it is the product of

voluntary service by Trustees who either charge less than their usual rates, or not at all, for their work on the Council's behalf.

There are other sources of economy. In addition to indirect cost savings, the Council encourages university contributions to direct costs, and makes that an element of judgement in the competition for award of contracts. Scholar-applicants know that their budgets will be scrutinized by the Trustees, who are experienced research scholars themselves, and know real costs from inflated ones. The Trustees also frequently know the financial conditions of universities and even of applicants. That awareness not only deters budget inflation in a competitive setting, but often results in further reduction of applicants' budgets by the Trustees as a condition of award. Moreover scholars know that every dollar they save will go to make possible the work of some colleague in the profession, and therefore the researchers themselves practice economy. As a consequence the Council has had no cost-overruns, but, on the contrary, has had modest recoveries from under-expenditure on completed contracts.

It is impossible to calculate an accurate dollar figure, but the savings as against the cost of an equivalent research program contracted for directly by the Government are between 25-50%, and perhaps more.

Quality. Individual reactions to individual research reports done under Council auspices vary. Understandably so, given the wide variety of knowledge and interests among the Government readers.

There has been only one systematic judgement, and the results of that were gratifying. The CIA requested an evaluation by its own specialists of 25 of the Council's reports on two counts, quality of research, and usefulness. Twenty one of the reports were judged "good" or "excellent" on both counts.

The Council has built quality control into the program from start to finish. The proposals are reviewed by all the Trustees, know their professional colleagues (and have taught many of them), know the subject matter, the research methods, available data, and current, as well as past, work in the field. Once a contract is awarded, they designate one of their number best qualified in the subject to stay in close touch with the researchers to monitor progress, and to help with problems should they arise. The Trustees also review all research reports, and frequently request additions or improvements, before submitting them to the Government.

There have also been two outside reviews of the structure and functions of the Council overall. Both the President's Commission on Foreign Language and International Studies, and the General Accounting Office have commended the Council as a model for federal funding of advanced research.

Finally, it seems appropriate to identify the ways in which the Government would maintain oversight of the programs to be conducted under the provisions of the proposed legislation.

-The research agenda which would guide the national research program on the USSR and Eastern Europe would be drawn up in consultation with federal officials designated by the Secretary of State. If current practice is any indicator, these same individuals would be among those who would receive the reports of research and findings, and would thereby monitor the program.

-The annual disbursement from the Government to the National Council would be preceded by application to the Secretary of the Treasury which would have to describe the purposes and programs for which the payment would be used. The Secretary of the Treasury would be free to seek the advice of the same group of individuals designated by the Secretary of State, or any other advisors he might chose.

-The National Council would submit annual reports of its activities under the Act, including an annual financial audit, to the President and the Congress.

-The principal of the fund, kept within Treasury, could, of course, be withdrawn from the fund and retired to general funds whenever the Government wished to terminate the program.

-It is also one of the duties under the Act to facilitate research collaboration between Government and private specialists, which will ensure a wide awareness within knowledgeable Government circles of the quality of the work sponsored under the Act.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

STATEMENT

on

"Soviet-Bloc Research and Training Act of 1982"
(S.2919)

by

Herbert S. Levine
University of Pennsylvania
Chairman, National Council for Soviet
and East European Research

Prepared for Hearings of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations,
September 22, 1982

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee:

INTRODUCTION

I appear before you today both in my capacity as a professor at the University of Pennsylvania and as Chairman of the Board of Trustees of the National Council for Soviet and East European Research.

The National Council, which will be the executive arm for the legislation under consideration, was founded in 1978. It is a product of the concern shared by many in the Federal Government and the academic community over the national decline affecting Soviet studies since the late 1960s. At the same time that support by universities, foundations, and the Government was dwindling rapidly, the capacity for basic research on the USSR and Eastern Europe within the Government was also shrinking, or at least so it was perceived at very high levels. A variety of steps were advocated in response. What emerged after several years of discussion among Government officials and scholars across the country was the National Council: a federally funded, non-profit, autonomous academic corporation whose purpose is to develop and sustain a long-term program of basic research on a national scale dealing with policy issues and questions of Soviet and East European social, political, economic and historical development. Through the conduct of this research program, the Council also endeavors to encourage the training of professional personnel capable of sustaining the program. The Council pursues its purpose by providing through national competitions, research funds to independent scholars via

research contracts with their universities. It does not itself perform research. The results of the research are delivered to the funding Government agencies, but are the property of the individual scholars who retain the right to copyright and publish their research.

THE COUNCIL STRUCTURE

The National Council for Soviet and East European Research consists of a Board of Trustees and an executive staff. The original twelve members of the Board were designated to their office by the Chancellor of the University of California, Berkeley; the Provost of the University of Chicago; the Presidents of Columbia University, Duke University, Harvard University, the University of Illinois, Indiana University, the University of Michigan, the University of Pennsylvania, Stanford University, and the American Association for the Advancement of Slavic Studies; and the Chairman of the Academic Council of the Kennan Institute for Advanced Russian Studies of the Wilson Center. The right to designate a Trustee remains with these institutions unless, upon the departure from the Board of such a designee, the Board decides to turn to some other institution for designation. The Trustees may also elect up to six additional members to the Board for a maximum total of eighteen.

All Trustees, whether designated or elected, serve as individuals and not as representatives of their home institutions. They serve three year terms. No Trustee may serve more than two consecutive terms in office. The Trustees establish Council policies, review and select proposals for funding, represent the Council for substantive

questions on research contracts, and conduct most of the Council's substantive business. Administration and management are the responsibility of an Executive Director appointed by the Board.

FUNCTIONS OF THE COUNCIL

In recognition that the national interest is served by a capacity to generate and disseminate reliable independent knowledge of the USSR and Eastern Europe, the Council was to be the vehicle for a Government share of funds in support of that national capacity; while the scholarly composition of the Council's Board of Trustees and the Council's autonomy of decision were to insure against Government prescription of research and to protect freedom of inquiry and conclusion. The support provided through the Council was intended to encourage existing scholars not to leave the field of Soviet studies, and to encourage new scholars to enter it, not just through the actual dollars transmitted, but also by having the long-term commitment of the Government serve as witness that the society recognizes and values their work.

It was established that the Council would meet annually with representatives of Government using-agencies to review the program and discuss subject areas of special interest, and that the Council would from time to time set out, in relatively broad terms, a kind of research agenda based on those discussions. However, on the principle that free toilers in the vineyards of knowledge are the most productive, scholars were to be free to proffer research projects of their own choosing, and the central assumption was made that the overlap of what scholars wish to investigate and what the Government would

wish to have investigated is sufficiently extensive that a national program of a million dollars annually would fit easily into the space. A parallel assumption was that the products of research would be useful to the Government, would inspire further scholarship, and through publication would help inform the public at home and abroad. It was hoped that the cumulative knowledge of the field and of the scholars in it, embodied in the Council's Trustees, would make their choices wise, and that the respect in which they would be held by their colleagues would invest proposals, labors, and products with quality and timeliness. It seemed reasonable to expect that since the Council would support the central purpose of universities, i.e., scholarship, the latter would not cavil at cost sharing, and the program would be more frugal than one the Government could run directly.

And finally, the critical supposition was accepted that the value systems, habits of thought, and bureaucratic practices of the Federal and academic communities were not so incompatible as to prevent the Council from functioning between them without being crushed. It was thought that the Council might even serve in some small way as a bridge between Government and academia to ease the estrangement and mutual distrust of the previous decade.

The Council was incorporated in February 1978 in the full knowledge that it was an experiment and an act of faith in a difficult society, albeit supported by ample good will and a mass of ingeniously devised legal and administrative scaffolding. How has it fared? In a word, the record has been mixed. The research production has been good. But the instability, delays, and uncertainty in funding have

had serious repercussions on the program.

ACCOMPLISHMENTS

The Council has sought to carry out its joint academic-government mandate in three ways: contracts with universities for research by individual scholars, a variety of meetings, seminars, workshops, consultative conferences and pilot studies to stimulate research, and a large Soviet emigre survey project.

The centerpiece of the Council's activities has been the research contracts. To date, the Council has been able to contract for 79 projects involving 98 scholars from 58 institutions in 22 states (See Appendix). The projects have been in a wide range of fields including economics, political science, history, sociology and law. One-fifth have been on Eastern Europe. Eight have been Soviet minority nationality studies.

The product of each study is a final report which is distributed among the various government funding agencies. The researchers themselves use their work to write articles or to expand into books. To date, contract funds provided by the National Council have led to the publication of at least 9 books, 60 articles and 35 papers presented at professional meetings. Examples of the range of studies produced include:

1. A demographic study, using Soviet statistics, of a major population shift in the USSR from Slavic peoples to Moslem nationalities and the short-term and long-term implications of that shift;
2. A historical and political study of Soviet relations with

Latin America both state-to-state and within the international Communist movement;

3. A structural study of the Warsaw Pact military forces to understand their role as an internal control mechanism;

4. A study analyzing current trends in Soviet economic development and projecting trends forward to the end of the century.

5. An analysis of the political succession process in the USSR with a particular focus upon the possible outcomes of the Brezhnev succession.

Secondly, the Council has held and sponsored a number of meetings to formulate research, among them three meetings, in different parts of the United States, on Eastern Europe; a workshop on political decision-making in the USSR; conferences on defense economics and on the second economy, and two workshops on law and science and technology. The Council has helped finance two research newsletters, one on agriculture and the other on the military and society.

The third major area of activity of the Council has been the Soviet Interview Project. There are now over 100,000 former Soviet citizens recently arrived in the United States. Ever since this exodus began in the early 1970s it has been the ambition of American scholars to conduct a large scale systematic survey of these newcomers to find out what they could tell us of the USSR. Recently that became a possibility. At the request of the Government, the Council undertook to sponsor the design of such a survey, and signed two contracts with the University of Illinois to that end. The design is for a project that consists of a general survey of a systematically selected sample of approximately 3000 individuals, complemented by intensive interviewing of 1,500 more for specialized topics. The project is intended to fill

gaps in our knowledge of the structure and functioning of Soviet society and, to the extent possible, to measure change since the similar Harvard project of the early 1950s. It is estimated that the project, directed by a large research team with the aid of a professional survey organization, will take about five years. The design was completed and the project got underway in the autumn of 1981 under a separate contract between the Council and the Department of State. The benefits to the field and to the country should be considerable. A substantial number of established scholars will be involved, and a much larger number of graduate students and junior scholars are expected to take part. The data compiled, systematized, and made machine readable, will be available to all scholars and government specialists in the future and should provide material for much more research than even the project itself contemplates. The Harvard project of thirty years ago was the source of much valuable information and creative scholarship for years.

PROBLEMS

The major problem and the basic reason why the proposed legislation is so essential to the success of the Council's program derives from the fragility of the Council's funding. This funding has been dependent on changing individuals within Government and has been subject to repeated delays, wide fluctuations and great uncertainties. Scholars, who as it is said, punch calendars rather than time clocks, find it extremely difficult to operate under such conditions. Furthermore, in order to attract young scholars into the field, funding must be reliable over a long period of time. The following chart illustrates the fluctuations

and delays in the receipt of funds from one fiscal year to another.

COUNCIL FUNDING BY FISCAL YEAR

<u>Amount Received</u>	<u>Date Received</u>	<u>Total for Fiscal Year</u>
\$570,000	September 1978	FY-78 \$570,000
(In August 1978, the ACDA offered an additional \$50,000, but it could not be processed before the end of the Fiscal Year.)		

\$600,000	April 1979	
\$525,000	September 1979	FY-79 \$1,125,000

\$ 67,607	October 1979	
\$420,000	January 1980	
\$450,000	May 1980	
\$400,000	September 1980	FY-80 \$1,337,607

\$365,000	September 1981	FY-81 \$365,000
(In June of 1981 the DCI allocated \$125,000 which was not processed before the end of the Fiscal Year.)		

\$245,000	December 1981	
\$250,000	April 1982	
\$175,000	July 1982	FY-82 (to 9/21) \$670,000

The difficulty is three-fold. The Council and the field do not know from one year to the next whether there will be any funds, and whether, indeed, the Council will be in existence. They do not know what the level of funding will be, only that it fluctuates widely. They do not know when it may be available, but do know that contributions have been lost because the complexity of inter-agency transfers and contract modifications could not be completed before Fiscal Years ended.

Initial funding for the Council was provided by the Departments of

State and Defense, which were joined almost immediately by the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. For a variety of reasons, efforts to obtain contributions from the Departments of Agriculture, Commerce, and Energy, and the ICA have not been successful thus far. However, a contribution by the Director of Central Intelligence was made in 1981 and has been repeated this year. The Council was caught up, in 1981 in the review by the new Administration of all funding programs. Happily, the decision was ultimately favorable, but there was a delay of almost twelve months in the Council's ability to contract for research, and until the last moment it was uncertain whether the funds could be processed before they reverted to Treasury at the end of the Fiscal Year. Funding in 1982 has been nearly as uncertain, and in both years the amounts were sharply reduced (although the total for 1982 may yet change).

The uncertainties, delays, and sudden interruptions in the Council's support of the field have damaging immediate consequences, and make the attainment of its objectives uncertain in the long run. Applicants whose research projects have been approved are left unsure for a year or more whether they will be funded, and some are ultimately dropped for lack of expected funding. The start of research is sometimes delayed by as much as two years. Other research is interrupted for varying periods in mid-stream because the Council can fund two-year projects only one year at a time. The Council is unable to stimulate research on important topics because it can give no assurance of support, and as much as four years will pass from the time the Council announced its last research agenda to the time some of the projects designed in response to it will be able to produce results.

The Council's experience demonstrates that it is almost impossible to reconcile the academic schedule which demands forward teaching commitments almost a year ahead with the Federal schedule of appropriations, allocations, contract amendments and fiscal year deadlines, especially when several Government agencies are involved. The end result is that from the viewpoint of the specialists and potential trainees in the field, the entire effort is so uncertain and unreliable as to make a professional commitment dubious. That is why the funding procedure provided for in the proposed Act is so essential to achievement of the Act's long-range purposes.

FUNCTIONS OF THE NATIONAL COUNCIL UNDER THE ACT

Under the provisions of the proposed Act, the National Council will, first of all, monitor all dispersals of funds and will report to the Congress, the President, and the Secretary of the Treasury on activities supported by assistance under the Act.

Secondly, the Council will use its allotment to continue to carry out its research-based program in pursuit of its three long-term objectives: (1) to provide information, interpretation and policy recommendations to the Government; (2) to check the national decline in post-doctoral research on the Soviet Union and East Europe; and (3) to help ensure the development and availability of a cadre of highly competent professionals in the field to step into the shoes of the post-war generation of specialists.

It will provide funding by contract to universities on a cost-sharing basis for use in individual post-doctoral research projects focusing on such issues as the operation of and long-term prospects for the Soviet and

East European economies, including the defense burden; long-term developments in Soviet and East European foreign policies, especially as they affect the United States; long-term trends in Soviet and East European societies; and Soviet and East European intentions, objectives and policy options. Such studies should be especially concerned with the ability of the regimes to foster, manage, and contain processes of change and with the possible consequences of their efforts to do so. The Council will also provide funding for meetings, conferences, workshops, consultations, pilot studies and other activities to design, stimulate or facilitate relevant research, and the publication of results.

Finally, the National Council will organize a National Manpower Development Program and a Public Information Program.

National Manpower Development Program

The purpose of the National Manpower Development Program will be to foster flexible comprehensive integrated manpower training programs for young specialists pursuing long-term PhD disciplinary and short-term Masters-level area studies educational programs. The Program would seek to provide support at each stage in the training of Soviet and East European Affairs specialists. Funds would be made available on a competitive basis for students entering area studies programs. In addition, students, following a year or two of graduate training in an academic discipline, would be encouraged to apply for a Preparatory Fellowship. The aim of the Preparatory Fellowship Program would be to attract students who have already proven themselves in disciplinary programs, into the Soviet field. Preparatory Fellows could receive up to two years support at this stage of their educational careers to supplement their disciplinary training with work in the Soviet and East

European field (such as the study of appropriate foreign languages). After the Preparatory Fellowship period, a student would be eligible for the IREX exchange. Following the exchange experience, a graduate student could then apply for Dissertation Support or funds to support additional training necessary for the completion of the graduate education cycle of career development. In this manner, an integrated national program of long-range support for individual scholars based upon targeted goals of national need could develop.

The funding proposed is estimated to allow a pool of 40 students to receive support under the National Manpower Development Program at any one time. Since the length of the training program is envisaged to be on the average four years (excluding the year in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe under the IREX program), this pattern would generate an entry group of approximately 10 scholars each year. Therefore, the National Manpower Development Program will serve only as a minimal program designed to supplement already existing sources for graduate support. However, the new program would be sufficiently flexible and attractive as to encourage talented students to move into Soviet studies from various social science disciplines in order to pursue research interests and language training for areas of particular need.

The reorientation of many university social science programs away from area studies toward disciplinary approaches has made the initial placement of young Soviet and East European affairs specialists in teaching positions increasingly difficult. A National Junior Faculty Placement Program will be established to allow those participants in the National Manpower Development Program who choose to pursue an academic career an opportunity to teach through a cost-sharing program

with universities. It is also hoped that universities lacking a particular component of a well-rounded Soviet and East European Affairs Program might be encouraged by the existence of this cost-sharing arrangement to hire a younger scholar to meet such a need. The funding available would allow the placement of approximately 10 teaching fellows on a 50/50 cost-sharing arrangement in any one year. The term of appointment would vary according to the need of the scholar and of the university. However, three-year average terms of appointment would probably be the norm. It is anticipated that junior faculty would then be in a position to move into regular tenure track positions at the end of the fellowship period.

The National Manpower Development and National Junior Faculty Placement Programs would combine to create a coordinated program of support for young specialists in the Soviet and East European fields from the time a young scholar has established his or her position in a graduate program through to job placement. It will maximize the possibility of encouraging students to move into areas of particular national need while eliciting institutional responses to the decline of their Soviet and East European Studies Programs which might otherwise not be possible. In this manner, it would inhibit the further erosion of our Soviet and East European training capability while encouraging the production of trained specialists for public, private and educational service.

Public Information Program

The Public Information Program of the Soviet-Bloc Research and Training Fund would be used to support a variety of activities undertaken

by other institutions selected through a national competition designed to encourage the interaction of academic specialists with government analysts, members of the business community and the mass media, as well as the public at large. For example, the fund could support a series of Summer Workshops focusing upon specific topics. These workshops would bring together scholars, public officials, businessmen and journalists to discuss in depth a specific subject area of particular concern during a given period. Such a workshop program would, in particular, serve the needs of young faculty, businessmen and journalists who are located throughout the United States in areas that do not have strong research centers in Soviet and East European Studies. In addition, funds could be used to support public forums at which Soviet affairs specialists might discuss new developments in that part of the world. Finally, a significant proportion of the Public Information Program's funds would go to help finance university-supported media productions which would make use of local academic and non-academic specialists. Such programs have already been successful, for instance, in the State of Washington, where University of Washington officials produced a series of programs examining the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe for the local Public Broadcasting System affiliate.

With the National Council performing the functions just described, no new administrative bureaucracy will need to be created to administer the Act, either within the Government or outside of it.

THE NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR SOVIET AND EAST EUROPEAN RESEARCH

RESEARCH CONTRACT AWARDS BY THE NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR SOVIET AND EAST EUROPEAN RESEARCH

Since its formation in February 1978, the National Council has concluded 79 research contracts allocating a total of \$3,419,636 to research projects on the USSR and Eastern Europe. The investigators, their institutional affiliation, the project titles, the contracting institutions, and the allotted amounts in that order are listed below. Asterisk signifies that a Final Report has been submitted to the Government.

- * Robert Axelrod, University of Michigan; "Politics and Deception in the Soviet Press"; University of Michigan, \$19,558.
- * Alexandre Bennigsen, University of Chicago; Rasma Karklins, University of Chicago; "Ethnic Relations in the USSR"; University of Chicago, \$44,095.
- * Abram Bergson, Harvard University; "The Soviet Economy to the Year 2000"; Harvard University, \$24,600.
- * Joseph Berliner, Brandeis University; Barney Schwalberg, Brandeis University; Christopher Davis, University of Birmingham, United Kingdom; "The Economics of Soviet Social Institutions"; Harvard University, \$163,263.
- * Seweryn Bialer, Columbia University; "The Politics of Change in the Soviet Union"; Columbia University, \$20,832.
- * Yaroslav Bilinsky, University of Delaware; Tonu Parming, University of Maryland; "The Helsinki Watch Committees in the Soviet Republics"; University of Delaware, \$33,660.
- * Cole Blasier, University of Pittsburgh; "Soviet Relations with Latin America"; University of Pittsburgh, \$51,108.
- * Daniel Bond, SRI International-WFFA; "Study of Soviet Research on Multi-regional Modeling"; International Research and Exchanges Board, \$18,720.
- Morris Bornstein, University of Michigan; "Pricing of Research and Development Services in the USSR"; University of Michigan, \$47,309.
- George Breslauer, University of California, Berkeley; "Policy Orientation of 1st Party Secretaries in the RSFSR," University of California, Berkeley, \$35,000.
- * Paul Cocks, Stanford University; "The Role of the Party in Soviet Science and Technology Policy"; Stanford University, \$22,740.
- Stephen F. Cohen, Princeton University; "The Social Dimensions of De-Stalinization"; Princeton University, \$20,000.
- Stanley Cohn, SUNY-Binghamton; "Soviet Investment Policy Imperatives," SUNY-Binghamton, \$30,000.

Approved For Release 2005/12/14 : CIA-RDP86B00985R000300130019-6

Fyodor Kushnirsky, Temple University; "The Regional Economy of the Soviet Union: A Modeling Study"; Wharton Econometric Forecasting Associates, Inc., \$103,138.

*Gail Lapidus, University of California, Berkeley: "Workshop on Contemporary Soviet Policy-Making"; University of California, Berkeley, \$21,350.

Richard Laurino, Center for Planning and Research, Incorporated; "A Study of Red Army History"; Center for Planning and Research, Incorporated, \$15,000.

Wassily Leontief, New York University; "The Position of the Soviet Union in the World Economy"; New York University, \$50,000.

Ronald Linden, University of Pittsburgh; "The Impact of International Change on Romania and Yugoslavia," University of Pittsburgh, \$50,000.

*Bernice Madison, San Francisco State University; "The Soviet Welfare System"; San Francisco State University, \$53,055.

*Peter Maggs, University of Illinois, Donald Barry, Lehigh University; Gordon Smith, University of South Carolina; "Soviet and East European Law and the 'Scientific-Technical Revolution'"; University of Illinois, Urbana, \$64,376.

*Shane Mahoney, Eastern Washington State University; "Role of the Soviet General Staff in Military Management"; Eastern Washington State University, \$29,994.

*Michael Marrese, Northwestern University; Jan Vanous, University of British Columbia; "Costs and Benefits of Soviet Trade with Eastern Europe"; Northwestern University, \$56,645.

News- Bruce Menning, Miami University (OH): "Military and Society in Russia and Eastern Europe: A Research Newsletter"; Miami University, \$10,246.

*James Millar, University of Illinois, Urbana; "Contemporary Soviet Society: A Study Based on the Third Soviet Emigration" (Design); University of Illinois, Urbana, \$254,260.

*James Millar, University of Illinois, Urbana; "Contemporary Soviet Society: A Study Based on the Third Soviet Emigration" (Design); University of Illinois, Urbana, \$46,500.

Martin Miller, Duke University; "Mental Illness in the Soviet Union," Duke University, \$39,504.

Adel Nikolskaya, Illinois State University; Maria Neimark; Natalie Sadomskaya; "Soviet Family of Two Post-War Generations"; Illinois State University, \$92,349.

Martha Olcott, Colgate University; "The Development of Nationalism in Kazakhstan"; Colgate University, \$35,000.

Jeffrey Osleeb, Boston University; Craig ZumBrunnen, University of Washington; "Energy Consumption and Analysis of Optimal Interregional and International Flows in the Soviet Iron and Steel Industry"; Boston University, \$34,162.

*Walter Pintner, Cornell University; "Russian Army and Russian Society, 1700-1917"; Cornell University, \$16,799.

*Alex Pravda, University of Michigan; "Industrial Workers and Political Development in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe"; University of Michigan, \$39,360.

Gilbert Rozman, Princeton University; "Soviet Perceptions of Contemporary China"; Princeton University, \$18,030.

Approved For Release 2005/12/14 : CIA-RDP86B00985R000300130019-6

Approved For Release 2005/12/14 : CIA-RDP86B00985R000300130019-6

- * Boris Rumer, Harvard University; "The Dynamics of the Capital Coefficient of USSR Industrial Output"; Harvard University, \$70,974.
- * Boris Rumer, Harvard University; "The Investment Process in Siberian Industry," Harvard University, \$27,322.
- * Stephen Sacks, University of Connecticut; "Large Corporations Under Yugoslav Socialism"; University of Connecticut, \$20,000.
- * David Segal, University of Maryland; Janet Schwartz, George Mason University; "Military Service and Civilian Employment in the Soviet Union"; University of Maryland, \$48,000.
- * Louise Shelley, American University; "The Role of Law in Soviet Society"; American University, \$48,996.
- Brian Silver, Michigan State University; Barbara Anderson, Brown University; "Language and Ethnic Identity in the USSR," Michigan State University, \$9,546, Brown University, \$10,429
- Dimitri Simes, Johns Hopkins University; "Soviet Military and Society"; Johns Hopkins University, \$95,526.
- * Robert Stuart, Rutgers University; Paul Gregory, University of Houston; "Fertility and Labor Supply: The USSR and Eastern Europe"; Transecon, Incorporated, \$44,076.
- * Robert Taaffe, Indiana University; "The Effects of Contemporary Soviet Approaches to Regional Planning, Locational Analysis and the Resolution of Regional Conflict on the Development of Siberia and the Soviet Far East"; Indiana University, \$33,541.
- * Judith Thornton, University of Washington; "Soviet Response to Changing Fuel Costs and Availabilities: The Case of Electric Power"; University of Washington, \$28,281.
- * Robert Tucker, Princeton University; "Stalin: A Case Study in History and Personality"; Princeton University, \$20,000.
- * Tibor Vais, Harvard University; "Studies in East European Labor Economics," Harvard University, \$30,798.
- * Elizabeth Valkenier, Columbia University, "Soviet-Third World Relations: The Economic Bind"; Columbia University, \$13,001.
- * Elizabeth Valkenier, Columbia University, "Soviet-LDC Relations in an Interdependent World Economy"; Columbia University, \$26,361.
- * Nils Wessell, Lafayette College; "Ground Rules for Soviet and American Involvement in Regional Conflicts"; Foreign Policy Research Institute, Incorporated, \$13,740.
- Sharon Wolchik, George Washington University; Jane Curry, Columbia University and Manhattanville College; "Specialists in the Policy Process in Poland and Czechoslovakia"; George Washington University, \$39,430.
- * Alexander Yanov, University of California, Berkeley; "The Debate on De-Stalinization in the USSR, 1961-1972"; University of California, Berkeley, \$21,000.
- * Murray Yanowitch, Hofstra University; "Work Attitudes and Work Organization in the Soviet Union"; Hofstra University, \$17,499.

Approved For Release 2005/12/14 : CIA-RDP86B00985R000300130019-6

APPENDIX

RESEARCH CONTRACT AWARDS BY THE
NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR SOVIET AND EAST EUROPEAN RESEARCH
SIGNED SINCE MARCH 1982

Raissa L. Berg, Washington University; "On the History of Genetics in the Soviet Union: Science and Politics; The Insights of a Witness"; Washington University, \$5,000.

Janet Chapman, University of Pittsburgh; "The Soviet Employment Service and the Search for Efficiency"; University of Pittsburgh, \$30,000.

Ralph Clem, Florida International University; "A User's Guide to Soviet Censuses"; Florida International University, \$14,821.

Kenneth Jowitt, University of California, Berkeley; "Communist International Relations"; University of California, \$60,000.

Gail Lapidus, University of California, Berkeley; "Ethnonationalism and Political Stability in the USSR"; University of California, Berkeley, \$45,000.

Robert A. Lewis, Columbia University; "Regional Population Growth in the USSR and its Impact on Society: 1897-1979"; Columbia University, \$74,696.

Gur Ofer, Harvard University; "Economics of the Soviet Urban Household in the 1970s"; Harvard University, \$25,000.

Mervyn Matthews, Stanford University; "Poverty in the Soviet Union"; Stanford University, \$48,000.

Vladimir Shlapentokh, Michigan State University; "Social Values in the Soviet Union After 1953"; Michigan State University, \$33,430.

Ivan Szelenyi, University of Wisconsin-Madison; "Part-time Family Farming in Contemporary Hungary"; University of Wisconsin-Madison, \$29,549.

INSTITUTION

STATE

Northwestern University	Illinois
Princeton University	New Jersey
San Francisco State University	California
Stanford University	California
State University of New York-Binghamton	New York
Transecon, Incorporated	New Jersey
Tufts University	Massachusetts
University of Arizona	Arizona
University of California, Berkeley	California
University of Chicago	Illinois
University of Connecticut	Connecticut
University of Delaware	Delaware
University of Illinois - Urbana	Illinois
University of Maryland	Maryland
University of Michigan	Michigan
University of Pennsylvania	Pennsylvania
University of Pittsburgh	Pennsylvania
University of Texas - Austin	Texas
University of Virginia	Virginia
University of Washington	Washington
University of Wisconsin-Madison	Wisconsin
Washington University-St. Louis	Missouri
Wharton Econometric Forecasting Association	Pennsylvania
Incorporated	
Yale University	Connecticut

TRANSMITTAL SLIP		DATE 7 Jan 1982
TO: [redacted] Coordinator for		
ROOM NO. 7B18	BUILDING Academic Affairs Headquarters	
REMARKS: The attached material includes recent statements by NCSEER officials (Vlad Toumanoff, Executive Director, and Herb Levine, Chairman) that are updated reworkings of the information and remarks from the March 17, 1982 statement on the Council. This material provides a quick fix on the present status of the Council its activities, and how it relates to the broader legislation being proposed and the field of Soviet Studies generally. As I mentioned on the phone, if you have any questions I'll be glad to try to answer them.		
FROM: [redacted] SOVA/PA/D		
ROOM NO. 3N21C	BUILDING Plaza	EXTENSION [redacted]